



INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

(51) International Patent Classification ⁷ : H04Q 3/00	A2	(11) International Publication Number: WO 00/25527
		(43) International Publication Date: 4 May 2000 (04.05.00)

(21) International Application Number: PCT/SE99/01696

(22) International Filing Date: 24 September 1999 (24.09.99)

(30) Priority Data:
09/181,583 28 October 1998 (28.10.98) US

(71) Applicant: TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON
(publ) [SE/SE]; S-126 25 Stockholm (SE).

(72) Inventors: TSE, Edwin; 4976 Jean Brillant, Montreal, Quebec
H3W 1T7 (CA). GOSSELIN, Nicolas; 110 du Blainvillier,
Blainville, Quebec J7C 4Y1 (CA).

(74) Agent: ERICSSON RADIO SYSTEMS AB; Common Patent
Dept., S-164 80 Stockholm (SE).

(81) Designated States: AE, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BY, CA, CH, CN, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, EE, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, NO, NZ, PL, PT, RO, RU, SD, SE, SG, SI, SK, SL, TJ, TM, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, UZ, VN, YU, ZA, ZW, ARIPO patent (GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZW), Eurasian patent (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European patent (AT, BE, CH, CY, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PT, SE), OAPI patent (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).


Published

Without international search report and to be republished upon receipt of that report.

(54) Title: ALARM CORRELATION IN A LARGE COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

(57) Abstract

A system and method of correlating alarms from a plurality of network elements (NEs) in a large communications network. A plurality of uncorrelated alarms are collected by an alarm collector (11) from alarm reporters (12). An alarm correlator (15) then partitions the alarms into correlated alarm clusters (61-63) such that alarms of one cluster have a high probability that they are caused by one network fault. The partitioning of the alarms is performed by creating alarm sets, expanding the alarm sets into alarm domains, and merging the alarm domains into alarm clusters if predefined conditions are met. The sets are formed by selecting an alarmed NE at the highest network hierarchy level which is not tagged, finding all of its contained NEs, and finding NEs that are peer-related to those contained NEs that are in an alarmed state (31-39). The sets are expanded into domains by finding NEs that are not in an alarmed state which contain the highest level alarmed NE in each alarm set (41-47). The domains are merged into one alarm cluster if the two domains have at least one common NE, at least one of the common NEs is not tagged, and the majority of the NEs contained by the non-tagged common NE are in an alarmed state (51-59).



FOR THE PURPOSES OF INFORMATION ONLY

Codes used to identify States party to the PCT on the front pages of pamphlets publishing international applications under the PCT.

AL	Albania	ES	Spain	LS	Lesotho	SI	Slovenia
AM	Armenia	FI	Finland	LT	Lithuania	SK	Slovakia
AT	Austria	FR	France	LU	Luxembourg	SN	Senegal
AU	Australia	GA	Gabon	LV	Latvia	SZ	Swaziland
AZ	Azerbaijan	GB	United Kingdom	MC	Monaco	TD	Chad
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina	GE	Georgia	MD	Republic of Moldova	TG	Togo
BB	Barbados	GH	Ghana	MG	Madagascar	TJ	Tajikistan
BE	Belgium	GN	Guinea	MK	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	TM	Turkmenistan
BF	Burkina Faso	GR	Greece	ML	Mali	TR	Turkey
BG	Bulgaria	HU	Hungary	MN	Mongolia	TT	Trinidad and Tobago
BJ	Benin	IE	Ireland	MR	Mauritania	UA	Ukraine
BR	Brazil	IL	Israel	MW	Malawi	UG	Uganda
BY	Belarus	IS	Iceland	MX	Mexico	US	United States of America
CA	Canada	IT	Italy	NE	Niger	UZ	Uzbekistan
CF	Central African Republic	JP	Japan	NL	Netherlands	VN	Viet Nam
CG	Congo	KE	Kenya	NO	Norway	YU	Yugoslavia
CH	Switzerland	KG	Kyrgyzstan	NZ	New Zealand	ZW	Zimbabwe
CI	Côte d'Ivoire	KP	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	PL	Poland		
CM	Cameroon	KR	Republic of Korea	PT	Portugal		
CN	China	KZ	Kazakstan	RO	Romania		
CU	Cuba	LC	Saint Lucia	RU	Russian Federation		
CZ	Czech Republic	LI	Liechtenstein	SD	Sudan		
DE	Germany	LK	Sri Lanka	SE	Sweden		
DK	Denmark	LR	Liberia	SG	Singapore		
EE	Estonia						

ALARM CORRELATION IN A LARGE COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

5

Technical Field of the Invention

This invention relates to software fault management systems and, more particularly, to a method of correlating multiple network alarms in a large communications network.

10

Description of Related Art

In communications networks, a single network fault may generate a large number of alarms over space and time. In large, complex networks, simultaneous network faults may occur, causing the network operator to be flooded with a high volume of alarms. The high volume of alarms greatly inhibits the ability to identify and locate the responsible network faults.

15

In the 1997 IEEE paper, *Fault Isolation and Event Correlation for Integrated Fault Management*, the authors, S. Katker and M. Paterok, describe a state-of-the-art algorithm for alarm correlation. The Katker and Paterok algorithm, however, has several disadvantages. First, the algorithm processes alarms very inefficiently. As noted above, a single fault may trigger a large number of network alarms. For example, one fibre cut can result in hundreds of thousands of alarms being reported from circuits supported by the fibre. The Katker and Paterok algorithm initiates a large number of computing threads, each of which ultimately results in the same conclusion. Thus, an excessive amount of time and computational resources are utilized. Additionally, the Katker and Paterok algorithm fails to correlate network element (NE) alarms that are caused by a faulty NE that does not itself generate an alarm.

20

25

30

In order to overcome the disadvantages of existing solutions, it would be advantageous to have a system and method of correlating large numbers of network alarms which greatly reduces the time and computational resources utilized, and

-2-

supports near real-time alarm correlation. The present invention provides such a system and method.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

5 In one aspect, the present invention is a system for correlating alarms from a plurality of network elements (NEs) in a large communications network. The system comprises a plurality of alarm reporters that report alarms from the NEs when faults are detected, and an alarm correlator that partitions the alarms into correlated alarm clusters such that alarms of one cluster have a high probability that they are caused by
10 one network fault.

 In another aspect, the present invention is a method of correlating alarms from the NEs in a large communications network. The method includes the steps of collecting a plurality of uncorrelated alarms from the NEs, and partitioning the alarms into correlated alarm clusters such that alarms of one cluster have a high probability
15 that they are caused by one network fault. The step of partitioning the alarms into correlated alarm clusters may include the steps of creating alarm sets, expanding the alarm sets into alarm domains, and merging the alarm domains into alarm clusters if predefined conditions are met. The domains are merged into one alarm cluster if, and only if, the two domains have at least one common NE, at least one of the common
20 NEs is not tagged, and the majority (as defined by the network operator) of the NEs contained by the non-tagged common NE are not in an alarmed state.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

 The invention will be better understood and its numerous objects and
25 advantages will become more apparent to those skilled in the art by reference to the following drawings, in conjunction with the accompanying specification, in which:

 FIG. 1 is a time line illustrating the sequence of tasks for network fault management;

 FIG. 2 is a functional block diagram illustrating the data flow between
30 functional blocks of the present invention;

 FIG. 3 is an illustrative drawing of two simple span relations;

-3-

FIG. 4 is an illustrative drawing of a simple contain relation;

FIGS. 5A-5C are a flow chart illustrating the steps of the preferred embodiment of the method of the present invention; and

FIG. 6 is an illustrative drawing of the relationship between alarm domains and alarm clusters.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EMBODIMENTS

The present invention is a method of partitioning alarms into sets in such a way that each set of alarms is probably caused by the same fault. The method utilizes network alarm propagation characteristics, alarm cause codes, network hierarchy (digital/analog hierarchy and equipment containment hierarchy), and network topology information to partition the alarms into sets. Presentation of alarms in partitioned sets reduces the time required to locate network faults so that more time can be spent fixing them. By assigning network operators to locate network faults based on alarm sets rather than alarm severity, alarm type, or reporting location, duplication of effort is reduced. The present invention greatly reduces computational time and resources required to provide rapid, consistent, and repeatable alarms correlation. Thereafter, the network operator may perform known fault location and identification techniques in a more accurate and efficient manner. The method of the present invention is simple, does not depend on experienced network operator knowledge to be captured and tailored to each network, and can be executed in parallel to increase speed.

FIG. 1 is a time line illustrating the sequence of tasks for network fault management. At time point A, a network fault occurs. The fault management process must then perform five tasks 1-5 in order to restore the network to full operational capability. The tasks are to (1) collect alarms and alert the operator of the alarms caused by the network fault, (2) correlate alarms, (3) locate the fault(s) causing the alarms, (4) test to confirm fault location, and (5) repair the faults and restore the network. At time point B, the paying customer perceives that lower quality of service is being provided. The objective of the fault management process, then, is to restore the network before the customer perceives any drop in quality of service. Thus, the more rapidly tasks 1-5 can be performed, the greater the likelihood that the network

can be restored in time.

The present invention performs three major tasks to achieve its overall objectives. First, the method partitions reported network alarms into related sets (called correlated alarm sets) such that alarms of one set have a high probability that they are caused by one network fault. Second, the method displays the correlated alarms in a list in an Alarm Viewer (AV). Correlated alarms of one set are sorted based on severity, time, etc. and then sequentially listed in the AV. Third, the method displays the alarms in the AV in graphical form. Alarmed managed objects whose alarms are in one correlated alarm set are displayed as nodes of a graph. Non-alarmed managed objects that propagate alarms within the set are displayed as different nodes of the same graph. If there are multiple network faults, then multiple graphs are displayed.

FIG. 2 is a functional block diagram illustrating the data flow between functional blocks of the present invention. An Alarm Collector (AC) 11 collects uncorrelated alarms from various Alarm Reporters (AR) 12 and stores them in its persistent memory 13. The alarm reporters may be part of a NE or external to a NE. Alarm reporters report alarms to the alarm collector using a normalized format. Operators can view these uncorrelated alarms using the Alarm Viewer (AV) 14. The Alarm Correlator (ACOR) 15 reads uncorrelated alarms from the AC, separates the alarms into correlated alarm sets, and stores them in its cache memory 16. The alarm viewer, on demand by the operator, fetches correlated alarm sets for display.

The alarm correlator 15 is not event driven in the sense that the alarm correlator will not start a thread (of execution) based on each incoming alarm. In a large network, an alarm rate of 1 alarm per second is not uncommon. In case of an alarm storm caused by a high capacity facility failure (a situation when the alarm correlation method is most useful), the alarm rate can be much higher. Execution threads, spawned at such a rate, may not be able to do meaningful work since they all are competing for limited system resources. Instead, the alarm correlator takes a "snapshot" of all alarms in the network at any moment, correlates the alarms in multiple passes into alarm clusters, and processes each correlated alarm cluster in one thread.

Before execution of the thread, the alarm correlator 15 has NE information in

-5-

its cache memory 16. Therefore, the correlation method can proceed at memory speed. There is no requirement for the alarm correlator, while executing the thread, to query other systems or the network to retrieve required information, such as NE relations.

5 The correlation method of the present invention utilizes several types of input information. The types of relationships among NEs (managed objects) are important inputs to the methodology. Three key types of NE relationships are the span relation, the contain relation, and the peer relation. Examples of span relations are "Circuit-XYZ spans 6 routing nodes" or "Circuit-ABC spans 8 facilities".

10 FIG. 3 is an illustrative drawing of two simple span relations. The span relation is uni-directional and one-to-many. An example of a span relation is "Circuit-XYZ spans 6 routing nodes". In FIG. 3, line A which is drawn through facilities 21 and 22 represents the span relation "Circuit-A spans two facilities". Line B which is drawn through facilities 21, 23, and 24 represents the span relation "Circuit-B spans three facilities".

15 FIG. 4 is an illustrative drawing of a simple contain relation. The contain relation is uni-directional and is one-to-many. Examples of contain relations are "a card contains 10 ports", "a log contains 200,000 records", and "a DS1 contains 24 DS0 circuits". In FIG. 4, lines C and D are drawn passing through facility 25 and illustrate the contain relation "facility-F contains two circuits".

20 The peer relation is bi-directional and is one-to-one. Examples of peer relations are "port-5 connects to one end of circuit-xyz" and "Circuit-xyz is used by customer-y".

25 To assist in partitioning the alarms into correlated alarm sets, the alarm correlator 15 constructs and maintains a database of NEs. This database carries minimal NE information such as name, relations, and alarm states of the NEs. The information in this database may be cached for fast performance. The information is updated whenever the configuration of the real network changes.

30 FIGS. 5A-5C are a flow chart illustrating the steps of the preferred embodiment of the method of the present invention. The present invention utilizes a three-pass methodology to provide rapid, consistent, and repeatable alarms correlation

-6-

(task 2 of FIG. 1). The method correlates alarms and partitions the alarms into correlated alarm clusters containing related alarms. The three passes are described below.

First Pass:

5 Referring to FIG. 5A, the first pass partitions alarms into sets and reduces the search space for the second and third passes. In an initialization step 30, all NEs are set to be "non-tagged" (i.e., not yet processed). At step 31, the method first determines whether or not there exists an alarmed network element (NE) that is non-tagged. If no such NEs exist, the method skips to the second pass. If one or more such NEs exist,
10 the method selects the one which is at the highest network hierarchy level at step 32. Starting with the selected NE, the method finds all lower level NEs at step 33 that are directly or indirectly contained in the selected NE. At step 34, all of the found NEs and the high level selected NE are all placed in a set. For each alarmed NE in the set, the peer relation is used at 35 to find peer-related NEs. All of the found peer-related
15 NEs are added to the set at 36. All NEs in the set are tagged at step 37. This creates one alarm set at 38. At step 39 it is determined whether or not the alarmed, non-tagged NE was the last alarmed NE that is non-tagged. If not, the method then returns to step 31, and repeats the process for each alarmed NE in the network that is not tagged. If the alarmed, non-tagged NE was the last alarmed NE that is non-tagged, the
20 method proceeds to the second pass. If there are "X" such NEs, then the first pass ends by creating X sets of NEs, and proceeds to the second pass in FIG. 5B.

Second Pass:

Referring to FIG. 5B, the second pass searches for higher level NEs that are not in an alarmed state or tagged, but that contain the highest level alarmed NE in each
25 set. To do so, the second pass begins at step 41 by selecting one of the X sets identified in the first pass. At 42, the method selects the alarmed NE that is at the highest network hierarchy level in the set. The span relation is utilized at 43 to find all span-related NEs. For each found NE, the span relation is utilized again at step 44 to find its span-related NEs. All of the found span-related NEs are added to the set at
30 45. The procedure in steps 42 to 45 is then repeated at step 46 for all X sets of alarms. The second pass ends at 47 with X sets of alarms called Alarm Domains being created.

-7-

The method then proceeds to the third pass in FIG. 5C.

Third Pass:

Referring to FIG. 5C, the third pass analyzes the Alarm Domains and merges two domains into one Alarm Cluster, based on the characteristics of one or more common NEs. The two domains are merged even if the common NE is not in an alarmed state. At step 51, the Alarm Domains are grouped into 2-domain pairs. At step 52, the method then compares the contents of each domain with the contents of the other domain with which it has been paired. The domains are merged into one alarm cluster if, and only if, the two domains have at least one common NE, at least one of the common NEs is not tagged, and the majority (as defined by the network operator) of the NEs contained by the non-tagged common NE are not in an alarmed state.

Thus, at step 53, it is determined whether or not the two domains share at least one common NE. If not, the method moves to step 54, and the domains are not merged. If there is at least one common NE, the method moves to step 55 where it is determined whether or not the common NE is tagged. If the common NE is tagged, the method moves to step 54, and the domains are not merged. If the common NE is not tagged, the method moves to step 56 where it is determined whether or not the majority of the NEs contained by the non-tagged common NE are in an alarmed state. If the majority of the NEs are not in an alarmed state, the method moves to step 54, and the domains are not merged. If the majority of the NEs are in an alarmed state, the method moves to step 57 where the two domains are merged into one Alarm Cluster. The procedure in steps 52 to 57 is then repeated at step 58 to merge all possible domains and create "Y" Alarm Clusters at 59.

FIG. 6 is an illustrative drawing of the relationship between alarm domains and alarm clusters. The figure includes three (3) alarm clusters 61-63. There are a total of six (6) alarm domains. Alarm cluster 61 includes three (3) alarm domains 64-66. Alarm cluster 62 includes one (1) alarm domain 67. Alarm cluster 63 includes two (2) alarm domains 68-69. NEs (represented by small circles) exist in the alarm domains, and at least one NE is in the alarmed state (dark circle) within each alarm domain. The relations between NEs are not shown in the figure.

-8-

In this manner, the present invention partitions alarms into Alarm Clusters in such a way that alarms in each cluster are probably caused by the same fault. The correlated alarm clusters can then be determined or calculated in one thread. In addition, by merging two Alarm Domains into one cluster when the common NE is not in an alarmed state, a probable faulty NE is identified even though it is not being reported in an alarmed state.

Alarm propagation characteristics dictate that faults occurring in the highest layers of the network hierarchy will cause related faults in the lower layers. For example, a fault at facility 25 of FIG. 4, will cause faults of the two contained circuits C and D. However, there are situations in which related alarms are not available at correlation time. One such situation is when, due to cost, the operator does not have fault detection devices on resources in the lowest layer. For example, a telephone network operator may not monitor all of its DS0 circuits; it may only monitor its DS1s (higher layer) for alarms. Another such situation is when a first operator leases capacity (in a higher layer) from a second operator in order to support the first operator's own circuits (lower layer). The first operator may never receive alarms from the second operator concerning faults in the leased capacity. It should be noted, however, that although the alarm correlator 15 makes use of alarm propagation from higher layers to lower layers, it does not rely on all related alarms (e.g., faults of higher and lower layers) being available at correlation time.

It is thus believed that the operation and construction of the present invention will be apparent from the foregoing description. While the system and method shown and described has been characterized as being preferred, it will be readily apparent that various changes and modifications could be made therein without departing from the scope of the invention as defined in the following claims.

WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:

1. A system for correlating alarms from a plurality of network elements (NEs) in a large communications network, said system comprising:

a plurality of alarm reporters that report alarms from the NEs when faults are detected; and

an alarm correlator that partitions the alarms into correlated alarm clusters such that alarms of one cluster have a high probability that they are caused by one network fault.

2. The system for correlating alarms of claim 1 further comprising an alarm collector that collects and stores alarms from the alarm reporters and provides uncorrelated alarms to the alarm correlator.

3. The system for correlating alarms of claim 1 wherein the alarm correlator includes:

means for creating an alarm set by selecting an alarmed NE at the highest network hierarchy level which is not tagged, finding all lower level NEs that are contained in the selected alarmed NE, finding all peer-related NEs for each alarmed lower level NE, and placing the highest level alarmed NE and all the found contained and peer-related NEs in the set; and

means for creating additional alarm sets by repeating the steps for creating the alarm set for each alarmed NE in the network which is not tagged.

4. The system for correlating alarms of claim 3 wherein the alarm correlator also includes means for finding faulty NEs which are not reporting alarm states while a majority of their contained NEs are reporting alarmed states.

5. The system for correlating alarms of claim 4 wherein the alarm correlator also includes means for merging two sets into one alarm cluster if the two sets have at least one common NE, at least one common NE is not tagged, and a

-10-

majority of the NEs contained by the non-tagged common NE are in an alarmed state.

6. In a large communications network having a plurality of network elements (NEs), a method of correlating alarms from the NEs comprising the steps of:
collecting a plurality of uncorrelated alarms from the NEs; and
partitioning the alarms into correlated alarm clusters such that alarms of one cluster have a high probability that they are caused by one network fault.

7. The method of correlating alarms of claim 6 wherein the step of partitioning the alarms into correlated alarm clusters includes the steps of:
creating a plurality of alarm sets;
expanding the alarm sets into a plurality of alarm domains; and
merging the plurality of alarm domains into alarm clusters if predefined conditions are met.

8. The method of correlating alarms of claim 7 wherein the step of creating a plurality of alarm sets includes the steps of:
creating a first alarm set, said step of creating a first alarm set comprising:
selecting an alarmed NE at the highest network hierarchy level which is not tagged;
finding all lower level NEs that are contained in the selected alarmed NE;
finding all peer-related NEs for each contained lower level NE which is in an alarmed state; and
placing the highest level alarmed NE and all the found contained and peer-related NEs in the first set; and
creating additional alarm sets, said step of creating additional alarm sets comprising:
selecting additional alarmed NEs in the network which are not tagged;
and
repeating the steps for creating the first alarm set for each selected

-11-

additional alarmed NE in the network which is not tagged.



9. The method of correlating alarms of claim 8 wherein the step of expanding the alarm sets into a plurality of alarm domains includes the step of finding NEs that are not in an alarmed state which contain the highest level alarmed NE in each alarm set.



10. The method of correlating alarms of claim 9 wherein the step of finding NEs that are not in an alarmed state which contain the highest level alarmed NE in each alarm set includes the step of expanding the alarm sets to create alarm domains, the step of expanding the alarm sets including the steps of:

- (a) selecting one of the alarm sets;
- (b) selecting an alarmed NE which is at the highest network hierarchy level in the selected set;
- (c) finding all NEs that are span-related to the selected alarmed NE;
- (d) finding all NEs that are span-related to each of the found NEs that are span-related to the selected alarmed NE;
- (e) adding all the found span-related NEs to the alarm set to create an alarm domain; and
- (f) repeating steps (b) through (e) for all of the alarm sets.

11. The method of correlating alarms of claim 10 wherein the step of merging the plurality of alarm domains into alarm clusters if predefined conditions are met includes the steps of:


- determining that two alarm domains have at least one common NE;
- determining that the common NE is not tagged; and
- determining that a majority of the NEs contained by the non-tagged common NE are in an alarmed state.

*FIG. 1**FIG. 2*

*FIG. 3**FIG. 4*

3/6

FIG. 5A



4/6




**FIG. 5B**

FIG. 5C

THIRD PASS



6/6

**FIG. 6**




INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

(51) International Patent Classification ⁷ : H04Q 3/00	A3	(11) International Publication Number: WO 00/25527 (43) International Publication Date: 4 May 2000 (04.05.00)
(21) International Application Number: PCT/SE99/01696 (22) International Filing Date: 24 September 1999 (24.09.99) (30) Priority Data: 09/181,583 28 October 1998 (28.10.98) US (71) Applicant: TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON (publ) [SE/SE]; S-126 25 Stockholm (SE). (72) Inventors: TSE, Edwin; 4976 Jean Brillant, Montreal, Quebec H3W 1T7 (CA). GOSSELIN, Nicolas; 110 du Blainvillier, Blainville, Quebec J7C 4Y1 (CA). (74) Agent: ERICSSON RADIO SYSTEMS AB; Common Patent Dept., S-164 80 Stockholm (SE).		(81) Designated States: AE, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BY, CA, CH, CN, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, EE, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, NO, NZ, PL, PT, RO, RU, SD, SE, SG, SI, SK, SL, TJ, TM, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, UZ, VN, YU, ZA, ZW, ARIPO patent (GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZW), Eurasian patent (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European patent (AT, BE, CH, CY, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PT, SE), OAPI patent (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG). Published With international search report. (88) Date of publication of the international search report: 17 August 2000 (17.08.00)

(54) Title: ALARM CORRELATION IN A LARGE COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK**(57) Abstract**

A system and method of correlating alarms from a plurality of network elements (NEs) in a large communications network. A plurality of uncorrelated alarms are collected by an alarm collector (11) from alarm reporters (12). An alarm correlator (15) then partitions the alarms into correlated alarm clusters (61-63) such that alarms of one cluster have a high probability that they are caused by one network fault. The partitioning of the alarms is performed by creating alarm sets, expanding the alarm sets into alarm domains, and merging the alarm domains into alarm clusters if predefined conditions are met. The sets are formed by selecting an alarmed NE at the highest network hierarchy level which is not tagged, finding all of its contained NEs, and finding NEs that are peer-related to those contained NEs that are in an alarmed state (31-39). The sets are expanded into domains by finding NEs that are not in an alarmed state which contain the highest level alarmed NE in each alarm set (41-47). The domains are merged into one alarm cluster if the two domains have at least one common NE, at least one of the common NEs is not tagged, and the majority of the NEs contained by the non-tagged common NE are in an alarmed state (51-59).



FOR THE PURPOSES OF INFORMATION ONLY

Codes used to identify States party to the PCT on the front pages of pamphlets publishing international applications under the PCT.

AL	Albania	ES	Spain	LS	Lesotho	SI	Slovenia
AM	Armenia	FI	Finland	LT	Lithuania	SK	Slovakia
AT	Austria	FR	France	LU	Luxembourg	SN	Senegal
AU	Australia	GA	Gabon	LV	Latvia	SZ	Swaziland
AZ	Azerbaijan	GB	United Kingdom	MC	Monaco	TD	Chad
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina	GE	Georgia	MD	Republic of Moldova	TG	Togo
BB	Barbados	GH	Ghana	MG	Madagascar	TJ	Tajikistan
BE	Belgium	GN	Guinea	MK	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	TM	Turkmenistan
BF	Burkina Faso	GR	Greece			TR	Turkey
BG	Bulgaria	HU	Hungary	ML	Mali	TT	Trinidad and Tobago
BJ	Benin	IE	Ireland	MN	Mongolia	UA	Ukraine
BR	Brazil	IL	Israel	MR	Mauritania	UG	Uganda
BY	Belarus	IS	Iceland	MW	Malawi	US	United States of America
CA	Canada	IT	Italy	MX	Mexico	UZ	Uzbekistan
CF	Central African Republic	JP	Japan	NE	Niger	VN	Viet Nam
CG	Congo	KE	Kenya	NL	Netherlands	YU	Yugoslavia
CH	Switzerland	KG	Kyrgyzstan	NO	Norway	ZW	Zimbabwe
CI	Côte d'Ivoire	KP	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	NZ	New Zealand		
CM	Cameroon			PL	Poland		
CN	China	KR	Republic of Korea	PT	Portugal		
CU	Cuba	KZ	Kazakhstan	RO	Romania		
CZ	Czech Republic	LC	Saint Lucia	RU	Russian Federation		
DE	Germany	LI	Liechtenstein	SD	Sudan		
DK	Denmark	LK	Sri Lanka	SE	Sweden		
EE	Estonia	LR	Liberia	SG	Singapore		

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No
PC, SE 99/01696

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
IPC 7 H04Q3/00

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)
IPC 7 H04Q H04L

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal WPI IEL INTERNET

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	KÄTKER S ET AL: "Fault Isolation and Event Correlation for Integrated Fault Management", CHAPMAN & HALL; LONDON, PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIFTH IFIP/IEEE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON INTEGRATED NETWORK MANAGEMENT, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, US XP002900953 page 583 -page 596 12 - 16th May, 1997 page 584, line 12 - line 29 page 588, line 20 -page 595, line 14; figure 5	1,2,6,7
A	---	3-5,8-11
	-/--	

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

* Special categories of cited documents :

- *A* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- *E* earlier document but published on or after the international filing date
- *L* document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- *O* document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- *P* document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

T later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

X document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

Y document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.

Z document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

3 April 2000

Date of mailing of the international search report

15. 05. 2000

Name and mailing address of the ISA
European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Klas Arvidsson

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PC., SE 99/01696

C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category °	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	US 5 646 864 A (WHITNEY CHRISTOPHER) 8 July 1997 (1997-07-08) column 2, line 7 - line 55; claims 1-12; figures 1,2 abstract	1,2,6,7
A	---	3-5,8-11
Y	EP 0 549 937 A (IBM) 7 July 1993 (1993-07-07) column 2, line 16 -column 3, line 7 column 8, line 56 -column 9, line 26; claims 1-3; figures 2,4A-C,8 abstract	1,2,6,7
A	---	3-5,8-11
P,Y	US 5 949 759 A (GALLIAN CATHERINE ET AL) 7 September 1999 (1999-09-07) column 2, line 48 -column 3, line 18; claims 1-3; figure 2 abstract	1,2,6,7
P,A	---	3-5,8-11
A	US 5 768 501 A (LEWIS LUNDY) 16 June 1998 (1998-06-16) column 3, line 17 - line 67; claims 1-24; figure 5 abstract	1-11
P,A	---	1-11
	US 5 946 373 A (HARRIS ROGER D) 31 August 1999 (1999-08-31) column 2, line 25 -column 3, line 9; claims 1-6; figures 1,2E,4 -----	

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PC, SE 99/01696

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
US 5646864	A	08-07-1997	AU 671882 B	12-09-1996
			AU 5573494 A	14-09-1994
			CA 2156427 A	01-09-1994
			DE 69313667 D	09-10-1997
			DE 69313667 T	19-03-1998
			DK 686329 T	20-04-1998
			EP 0686329 A	13-12-1995
			ES 2107792 T	01-12-1997
			WO 9419887 A	01-09-1994
			HK 1002945 A	25-09-1998
			JP 8506946 T	23-07-1996
			SG 47802 A	17-04-1998

EP 0549937	A	07-07-1993	US 5309448 A	03-05-1994
			JP 2088513 C	02-09-1996
			JP 5276164 A	22-10-1993
			JP 8004266 B	17-01-1996

US 5949759	A	07-09-1999	NONE	

US 5768501	A	16-06-1998	US 6000045 A	07-12-1999

US 5946373	A	31-08-1999	NONE	

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☒ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.